


PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 1163-0400P	
		Application Number 10/089,235-Conf. #4565	Filed March 28, 2002
		First Named Inventor Shigeru NAGATA et al.	
		Art Unit 2614	Examiner J. W. Desir
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="width: 60%;"> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant /inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>40,439</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____</p> </div> <div style="width: 35%; text-align: center;">  _____ Signature _____ D. Richard Anderson Typed or printed name _____ (703) 205-8035 Telephone number _____ September 15, 2006 Date </div> </div> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>			
<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.			

**REASONS IN SUPPORT OF
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

In the final Office Action (“Action”), the Examiner rejects claims 1-8, 11-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 00/38951 to Mathias et al. (“Mathias”). This rejection is improper because the cited reference fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

Independent claim 1 defines a video reproducing apparatus that includes, *inter alia*, at least a pair of units having separate housings; and a chassis for holding said units. In addition, the chassis includes a supporting unit that supports said pair of units during displacement and a fixing unit that fixes the displacement, wherein said pair of units are displaced in respective directions and fixed and housed in a predetermined position.

Mathias discloses a video display system that is mountable in a vehicle and removable for use outside the vehicle. The system of Mathias includes, *inter alia*, a digital video disc player that is integrally positioned within either the housing or the screen console. In other words, Mathias discloses that the display and DVD player may have separate housings (i.e., as shown in Fig. 1) or may be housed in the same unit, as shown in Figs. 4-10. Although Fig. 1 of Mathias includes separate housings for the two units, in this embodiment both units are *not* displaced in respective directions. In other words, in the separate housing embodiment of Mathias, the DVD player is not displaced, it is permanently fixed in the housing 34. Accordingly, Mathias fails to disclose an

embodiment which includes a pair of units which are displaced in respective directions and fixed and housed in a predetermined position as claimed.

In response to Applicants' arguments the Examiner asserts that Figs. 1 and 2 of Mathias clearly disclose an embodiment wherein the pair of units are displaced in respective directions because "the pair of units are rotatably mounted." To support this assertion, the Examiner points to page 6, lines 20-21 of Mathias. This assertion is unfounded for the following reasons.

As clearly shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of Mathias, it is the screen console 38 which is rotatably mounted to the housing 34, not both the screen console 38 and the DVD player 32, which the Examiner points to as being equivalent to the claimed pair of units. Accordingly, Mathias only discloses that *one* of the units is displaced, not *both* as claimed. Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Mathias because Mathias fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Claims 2-8, 11-16, and 18-21 variously depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-8, 11-16, and 18-21 are patentable over Mathias for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 11-16 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.